REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 12, and 22 in the February 2, 2009 Office action. Regarding the remaining pending claims 13-21 and 23, Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the February 2, 2009 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment E amends claims 13, 15, 20, and 23. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 11-23 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Claim 15 is objected for reciting "graphical element **as** an icon" rather than "graphical element **is** an icon." Applicants have amended claim 15 to correct the typographical error as suggested by the Office. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 13-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0125736 to Ferri et al. (Ferri). Applicants respectfully disagree. For claimed subject matter to be *prima facie* obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of prior art, the prior art references must individually or in combination disclose or suggest each of the requirements of the claim. MPEP §§ 2143-2143.01.

A. Claim 13

The system of claim 13 is directed to a system for generating a graphical user interface that selectively displays filenames associated with graphical elements (e.g., icons) in order to efficiently use the window space and maintain the information needed for users to easily identify the files associated with the graphical elements. In particular, the system of claim 13 includes a processing unit, memory, and a display. The memory stores processor executable instructions that, when executed, cause the generation of a graphical user interface. "[T]he graphical user

interface compris[es] a window section." "[T]he graphical user interface includ[es] at least *one graphical element displayed in the window section of the graphical user interface*, the graphical element having a filename associated therewith, *the filename being absent from the graphical user interface* as a result of a determination that data associated with a component of the filename is image data or multimedia data." The graphical element is "aligned more closely with surrounding graphical elements displayed in the same window section of the graphical user interface by reducing the space therebetween, the reduction resulting from the filename being absent from the graphical user interface." The graphical user interface also "includ[es] at least *one other graphical element and a filename associated therewith, displayed in the window section of the graphical user interface*, said filename being visibly displayed in the graphical user interface as a result of a determination that data associated with a component of said filename is not image data or multimedia data." (emphasis added).

As amended, claim 13 highlights that the same window section of the graphical user interface includes, both: (1) at least one graphical element having a filename associated therewith in which the filename is absent from the graphical user interface as a result of a determination that data associated with a component of the filename is image data or multimedia data; and (2) at least one other graphical element having a filename associated therewith in which the file is visibly displayed in the window section of the graphical user interface as a result of a determination that data associated with a component of the filename is image data or multimedia data.

In contrast, Ferri merely describes "a method of organizing icons on a desktop into groups and displaying the icon groups in segments on the desktop." (Ferri, paragraph [0010]). As discussed in the previously filed Amendment D, Ferri et al. fails to teach, disclose, or suggest determining for each graphical element of the plurality of graphical elements if a filename is or is not to be displayed with the graphical element when the graphical element is rendered, the determination being based on the type of object that the graphical element represents, the determination resulting in a filename not displayed with the graphical element when the graphical element is rendered if the data associated with a component of the filename is determined to be image data or multimedia data.

As pointed out by the office, FIG. 7 of Ferri illustrates a desktop having four segments including a top segment. The top segment contains icons in which the filenames associated with

the icons are not displayed. (Office action, page 3). However, nothing in Ferri suggests that the filenames for those icons are not displayed as a result of a determination as to whether the files are multimedia or image files.

To the contrary, Ferri teaches that whether the filenames are displayed is a result of a determination of the organization scheme selected by the user for the particular segment of the window. In particular, Ferri explains that the "[t]op segment contains icons which are organized in the smallest possible icon organization." (Ferri, paragraph [0041]). This organization scheme "shrink[s] all of the icons down to the smallest possible size that the icon source code supports and place[s] the shrunken icons as close together as possible within the segment." (Ferri, paragraph [0033]). Thus, Ferri teaches that filenames are displayed as a result of the determined organization scheme for the segment, rather than "as a result of a determination that data associated with a component of the filename is image data or multimedia data" as recited by claim 13.

Furthermore, even if Ferri could be interpreted to suggest that whether the filenames are displayed is based on a determination of the content of the file, Ferri fails to teach or suggest displaying, both, graphical elements with filenames visible and graphical elements with file names not visible *in the same window section of the graphical user interface*. As discussed above, Ferri teaches that whether a filename is displayed is a result of the organization scheme selected by the user for the particular segment of the window. The organization schemes taught by Ferri display each graphical element in the same manner. In particular, Ferri explains, as follows

> The icons may be organized in one of several manners. For example, one manner of organizing icons is to shrink all of the icons down to the smallest possible size that the icon source code supports and place the shrunken icons as close together as possible within the segment. When referring to icon size herein, the reference is to the visual dimensions of the icon on the Graphical User Interface (GUI) rather than the amount of memory used to store the icon. Another manner for organizing icons is to adjust the size of the icons to fill the segment. A third manner for organizing icons is to place the icons in the segment at their normal size, but if all of the icons do not fit into the segment, reduce the icons in size until the icons fit into the segment. A fourth manner for organizing icons is to place the icons in the segment at their normal size, and to add scroll bars to the segment if there is insufficient room in the segment for the icons. (Ferri, paragraph [0033]).

Thus, as illustrated in FIG. 7, for any particular segment of the window, Ferri teaches that the filenames will be displayed for all of the icons in the segment of the window or that the filenames will not be displayed for all of the icons in the segment of the window. Nothing in Ferri teaches or suggests that the filenames can be displayed for a selected sub-set of the icons in a single segment of the window.

As such, Ferri fails to teach or suggest, a "graphical user interface including at least one graphical element displayed *in the window section of the graphical user interface*, the graphical element having a filename associated therewith, the filename being absent from the graphical user interface" and "the graphical user interface including at least one other graphical element and a filename associated therewith *displayed in the window section of the graphical user interface*, said filename being visibly displayed in the window section of the graphical user interface" as recited by claim 13.

In view of the foregoing, Ferri fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 13. Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants submit that the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) that depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 13 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 13 is allowable.

B. Claim 23

Claim 23 is directed to a method of controlling the display of filenames in a graphical user interface. The method of claim 23 includes, in part, "rendering a plurality of graphical elements for concurrently displaying *in the same window section of a graphical user interface*, said plurality of graphical elements including *a first set of graphical elements having filenames determined not to be displayed* with said first set of graphical elements in the graphical user interface, and said plurality of graphical elements *including a second set of at least one graphical element having a file name determined to be displayed* with said graphical element in the graphical user interface."

As discussed above in connection with claim 13, Ferri teaches that whether a filename is displayed is a result of the organization scheme selected by the user for the particular segment of the window. The organization schemes taught by Ferri display each graphical element in the same manner. Thus, Ferri fails to teach or suggest displaying, both, graphical elements with

filenames visible and graphical elements with file names not visible *in the same window section of the graphical user interface*.

As such, Ferri fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 23. Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 12, and 22 in the February 2, 2009 Office action. Applicants submit that the remaining claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 11-23 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the claims. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. Bain/

Robert M. Bain, Reg. No. 36,736
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

RMB/NAS/eaw